HABS No. IA-140

Des Moines Art Center
Greenwood Park
Des Moines
Polk County
Iowa

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

DES MOINES ART CENTER HABS No. IA-140

Location: Greenwood Park, Des Moines, Polk County, Iowa

Present owner: Edmundson Art Foundation

Present use: Art gallery and school; sculpture gallery

Significance: The earlier portion of the building is a major work of Eliel Saarinen near the end of his career. The construction of this building provided the City of Des Moines with an excellent art gallery.

The process of its design provides insight on attitudes in Iowa in the mid-1940's toward modern architecture.

The sculpture gallery constitutes the later portion of the building and represents the work of another noted architect, I. M. Pei, to whom it was important that his addition, built eighteen years later and programmatically different, should harmonize with and complement the older building. The process of the design of the addition shows how a much larger structure than originally contemplated was built.

PART 1. HISTORY OF THE EARLIER PORTION

Date of construction: 1947-1948

Architects: Saarinen and Swanson, and Brooks and Borg. The designer was Eliel Saarinen, who was assisted by his son-in-law Robert F. Swanson. The Des Moines firm of Brooks and Borg made early design studies and prepared the working drawings for Saarinen's design.

General contractor: Neumann and Brothers, Des Moines, Iowa

Original and subsequent owners: Edmundson Art Foundation

Original and subsequent names: Des Moines Art Center

Process of Design: James Depew Edmundson, a Des Moines investment banker who died on April 18, 1933, had for some years before his death planned to leave the bulk of his estate to found an art gallery in Des Moines. As early as 1916 Edmundson, along with J. S. Carpenter, Jay Darling, and J. B. Weaver, who would play major roles in finally completing the building, and with others, founded the Des Moines Association of Fine Art. This group was to act as an interim organization until funds from Edmundson's will became available [12]. The will stipulated that funds would not be made available until ten years after probate. The money was held in trust, and the planning of the building was given to the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. The size of the gift was $600,000 plus any residue after other bequests had been fulfilled. Half the gift was designated to construct a building "to be as nearly fireproof as possible," $200,000 was to be placed in a trust for "the support and maintenance of the art museum," and $100,000 was set aside for the purchase of art works. The will instructed that the "corporation shall acquire with means other than this bequest sufficient and suitable grounds in the City of Des Moines, Iowa, on which to erect and maintain said Art Museum" [12].

Des Moines was also bequeathed a second art gift by Nathan and Winnie Coffin, which included an art collection. In order for the city to receive it, two requests had to be met. One was that "a proper room be especially assigned and maintained in an Art Gallery in Des Moines, Iowa, for the exclusive display of the objects," and the second was that income from the residue of the estate be used "for the purchase of works of art to be added to the Nathan Emory Coffin collection, and not used for the maintenance of

such Art Gallery" [12]. The Edmundson trustees hoped that the building they were planning would be the gallery selected by the Coffin Foundation to house the collection, and they planned on including such a room in designs for their building.

In June 1938, five years after Edmundson's death, Jay Darling, president of the foundation trustees, appointed a Committee on Site Plans and Related Matters to begin preliminary planning for a building whose construction funds would be made available in another five years. At the annual meeting the following May, the committee was charged with "the assembling of data on art museum design, size and specifications now in vogue and the collection of information on architectural firms specializing in art museums" [14].

In selecting a site the committee had to contend with the stipulation in the will that the gallery not be built "east of West Fourteenth Street, unless the smoke nuisance... shall have been so far abated or overcome" [12]. The committee selected seven potential sites. One was a block on East River Front between Walnut and Locust streets. Except for one lot, the city already owned the land. Two drawbacks to this site were that it was "not as easily accessible as locations on the west side of the river, and might not be in compliance with terms of the will." However, if the one lot could be bought and an air-conditioned building built, it "would be the Committee's first choice." Three of the selections were city parks: Union Park from East 9th Street to River Front on Jefferson Avenue; Drake Park on Cottage Grove Avenue between 23rd and 24th streets; and Greenwood Park's Grand Avenue frontage facing Polk Boulevard. The Greenwood Park site was considered "a more sightly location than the River Front" and complied with the provisions of the will. It provided space for ample parking, was easily

accessible, and was set in pleasant surroundings. As additional reinforcement, it was noted that other cities had built museums in parks. The remaining three sites were large old houses in the city. They included the former Winsor House on the south side of Grand Avenue at 31st Street, the former Edmundson Homestead at 3401 Grand Avenue, and Salisbury House on Tonawanda Drive. The problem with these sites was either that they were too small and additional property would have to be bought, or that they were too expensive and funds for their purchase would have to be found [14]. Carl Weeks, the owner of Salisbury House, had suggested in 1938 that the Edmundson Foundation, the Fine Art Association, and Drake University buy the house for an art center [12]. Terrace Hill was also considered but "any valid transfer at this time" was precluded. Based on their study the committee recommended meeting with the City Council and requesting transfer of the Greenwood Park site to the trustees [14]. The question of site selection was resolved by the committee in December 1939, when the choices were narrowed to Greenwood Park and to Salisbury House, which was then owned by Drake University. The motion favoring the park unanimously carried [21]. However, not everyone agreed with the committee, because in Darling's report in May 1940 he noted that "unexpected and unwarranted objections to the Greenwood Park location have caused an unfortunate delay" [15]. Although not described, the objections may have been from residents near the park, or people not wanting to see the park land built on, or possibly from people wanting to keep the museum closer to downtown. Some time between this report and the following one in 1941, the City Council approved of the Greenwood Park site [16].

The first action dealing with selection of an architect began at a special meeting in September 1940. Henry Nollen, Chairman of the Building

Committee, recommended that the trustees contact the firm of Proudfoot, Rawson, Brooks and Borg. No mention was made of "firms specializing in art museums." At the May 1941 meeting, John Brooks was introduced, and he reported on "various art museums which he visited on a recent tour of inspection" [16].

From a programmatic standpoint, some informal work had been accomplished by 1941. An Advisory Committee had been created which met with various city and public service groups. "Out of these conferences have come some very valuable and unsuspected suggestions which add greatly to the potential service of the museum." In addition to gallery space the building was being planned to include a lecture room and studios because "without them... a museum is likely to prove lifeless." Darling's report continued noting that "a very confusing amount of information was collected from existing museums in other cities," and while this contributed much "general knowledge" there was "very little specific information." The program being formulated at this time would have resulted in more of a community center than a professional art gallery and school. One reason for moving toward a community center was that there was only a relatively small collection of painting and sculpture. A second reason was the response from groups meeting with the Advisory Committee, who wanted to use the facilities. It was planned to have space for drama and dance groups and music and garden clubs. Also anticipated was the use of meeting rooms by groups like the Boy and Girl Scouts [16].

Mr. Gardner Cowles, Jr., a trustee for Drake University and a trustee for a home for the aged near the university as well, recommended use of the site of the home because the relocation of the home was then under consideration. However, it was decided that close ties with Drake University implied by

proximity seemed inconsistent with provisions of the Edmundson will that the museum be for the people of Des Moines and Iowa. "The Committee recommends that the Museum be a little gem set in the most beautiful surroundings available" [35]. The move to University Avenue was voted down.

In December 1941, the United States entered World War II, and with the subsequent disruption of the construction industry, the possibility of building after funds became available on May 15, 1943 seemed remote. It was thought that the additional time could be well spent on further planning and the purchase of stone to be ready for use at the end of the war [17]. At the annual meeting in June, 1943, it was moved to complete the plans and specifications as quickly as possible and apply to the government for a building permit [18]. The plans that were submitted to the War Production Board "may be completely revised and are not of necessity the plans which will finally be used when we are permitted to build [24]. During the next year two attempts to obtain a permit were turned down [19]. A major reason for trying to forge ahead was the fear that post-war inflation would rapidly decrease the size of a building that could be constructed for $300,000. However, in Darling's June 1943 report he complained that "public interest has died down... the Advisory Committee had come to a standstill; the Architect needs to be pushed ahead or a new one produced and all on the grounds that nothing can be done until after the war" [18].

Feeling that the plans which they had received were not satisfactory, the trustees called in Eric Cugler, a New York architect, to present plans with the possibility that he might become associated with John Brooks [25]. Gugler presented his design, which included an orangery, on January 4, 1944. His plans were rejected as extravagent and not suitable [13]. Also sometime during 1944 Jay Darling, at his own expense, had Clark Souers, a Des Moines

architect, prepare some plans which were rejected as impractical [13].

At another special meeting on January 25, 1944, John Brooks presented new plans about which "the comment was favorable." It was at this time the committee decided to request Eliel Saarinen to consult on the building. In an interview with the writer, John Brooks stated that he thought that Brooks-Borg had suggested Saarinen's name [4]. The minutes, however, say only that the name was suggested "by a number of Des Moines people" [28]. On June 13, 1944, it was moved to ask Saarinen to come to Des Moines [27].

In the meantime, there was much discussion of the nature of the building and of modern architecture. The idea of designing the building in a "modern style" was still not a totally accepted one. In trying to design a building "to satisfy these various groups" who wanted to use it, Brooks first prepared drawings for a building costing between $500,000 and $600,000 at 68¢ per cubic foot [19]. The plans submitted "attempted to strike a happy medium between dignity and practical usefulness" for about $300,000 [19]. In a proselyting role, the Building Committee noted that a "flat, sloping roof... may not be the dream type some had in mind. But, it is pointed out that the tendency in future architecture is simplicity, efficiency and low maintenance cost. A flat roof meets all these requirements, and when properly done has a beauty we recognize as we live with it." The same report continues with a statement of their philosophy: "Since architecture is one of the arts, and appearance is so important to the popularity of the museum, the building should be low so as to hug the ground and become part of the existing landscape. When finished, it should fit in its surroundings as a painting fits in a frame. It should be of no period or country, but 'Tailor-Made' for the use intended and the location selected; controlled by line, proportion, design, and of the best materials of the kind

selected. It should be pleasing in appearance, inviting and useful. It must compliment the art objects it houses, rather than compete with them. It must have an atmosphere of comfort yet be stimulating, informal and refined. It must be a place to linger--smoke if you like, visit, study, or work; and the cost must not exceed the $300,000 set aside in the Edmundson will" [19].

Several months later when a discussion of Saarinen's ideas and of his architecture was taking place, the Building Committee "discussed the trends of architecture and were of the opinion that the Des Moines museum should be a good example of the best architecture of the period in which it was built. The committee realized that this type of architecture would be new to many, and until they became accustomed to it, it would not be acceptable." Another statement on architecture then was included in the minutes:

> The other consideration is the art of architecture and is primarily the problem of the architect. We believe Des Moines will not want in years to come an imitation of Greek, Gothic or English architecture growing out of their needs. Rather have the best type of architecture of the period in which the museum is built, and which will take into consideration utility, cost of construction, and cost of maintenance. Any style different from what we are used to may seem strange at first, but this building will be judged in succeeding generations, and it must satisfy them or it will soon be obsolete (28).

One is reminded here of the statement made by James M. Willcox, president of the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society, in deciding to choose the style of modern architecture just becoming known in the United States for a skyscraper office building for his company. The building was designed by the architectural firm of Howe and Lescaze in the late 1920's and early 1930's. Willcox, looking to the future just as the building committee in Des Moines were doing some fifteen years later,

considered the possibility that "if this new style of architecture makes a back number of the styles that have preceded it, it is highly important that I should know this and become convinced of it" [41, p. 125]. As the result of Willcox's foresight, the skyscraper that was built for his company "stands as the most important tall building between those of Sullivan in the 1890's and the Seagram Building built sixty years later" [41, p. 143].

Regarding Saarinen's selection, Jay Darling commented at the annual meeting:

> It had been urged that we engage the architect who built the now famous Cranbrook Art Museum, Mr. Saarinen, as a consultant. His terms are high. If he comes for a brief survey and advise his fee is $125 per day, plus expenses. Any revision of plans or substitute plans... would not be included... and might be presumed to be several thousand dollars. But if we are to be certain that we have the most perfect Museum in design and arrangement that can be built within our budget the only sure method is to indulge in this extra cost" [19].

It was an extra cost that seemed a little high to some [28]. Nor was everyone happy with Saarinen's work. One trustee wrote, "As I think I told you, I think the exterior of the Cranbrook Museum is hideous, and if Mr. Saarinen plans on anything of that character for our Museum, I am unalterably opposed to it." He thought that the building committee and board agreed "that the design should be informal and present a homelike impression" [28].

Also at this time it was decided to use Lannon stone to "harmonize with the stone walks now in the formal garden, and [which] will always be available for extensions." If a special order brick was used there existed the possibility that it would be hard to match later on [19]. This fact indicated that there must have been some consideration of possible future expansion.

In July Saarinen came to Des Moines to "look at the site which he thought was ideal." During September a visit was made to Saarinen's office, and on the 25th an agreement was reached with him. He would prepare preliminary plans at 1/16" scale, a site model at 1/40" scale, and a building model at either 1/16" or 1/8" scale within 90 days for $5,000. The second stage was the preparation of "layout drawings in working drawing scale as well as detailed drawing and selection of materials and colors." This would be incorporated by the local architect, Brooks-Borg, who was to prepare the working drawings. Saarinen's fee for this part of the work was to be $2,500. During construction Saarinen, or persons from his office, would make five trips to Des Moines not to exceed ten days for $1,200 plus travel expenses [28].

On January 5, 1945 Saarinen and Swanson came to Des Moines to present preliminary plans to the trustees, John Brooks, and Paul Parker, who was to become the museum's director on June 1, 1945. After the architects left the meeting "a frank discussion about the preliminary sketches" was carried on. It was generally agreed they "were to serve in architectural design and that the interior arrangement was not as practical as it should be." In a letter to Darling, Forest Huttenlocher, chairman of the building committee, expands on the minutes and only after the architects left "the trustees woke up and said they did not like the plans, and that they looked too much like a factory." Just two of the trustees voted in favor of the plans. Huttenlocher was told to tell Eliel Saarinen that he would have to submit new plans [36]. At some point the Advisory Committee of the Fine Art Association must have seen some plans or sketches, because a letter from them was read at the meeting approving "the preliminary sketches submitted."

Later that day and the next Huttenlocher received other reactions to Saarinen's preliminary sketches. Parker came to him "with a pencil drawing of his idea of a floor plan for a museum, and telling me that Saarinen's plan was not good... the building was too sprawly and too long... should be more unified in a central condensed plan." Parker wanted to have Brooks develop his plan. Huttenlocher refused and thought that Parker's "plan is very much like some Brooks has made before." Two of the trustees also told Huttenlocher "how terrible they thought the Saarinen plan was; that it was all right for Hollywood, but not for Des Moines; that Saarinen was a Nazi at heart and we would not be regimented in this country." They wanted to call off the contract with Saarinen and forfeit the $2,000.

Rather than involve the entire board in reviewing plans and working out details, Darling suggested that John Brooks and Paul Parker work directly with Saarinen on the program, which had never been formally written down. Saarinen basically wrote his own program for the building, which he changed from a multi-purpose community center into a professional museum [4].

On March 22, 1945 Huttenlocher received "Plans No. 4," which were basically the design that was built. The Little Theater was omitted. The lecture room incorporated Parker's idea of a sloping floor. Two spaces "in opposite parts of the building" were assigned to the library and there was no kitchen. The estimated cost was 75¢ per cubic foot plus furniture and drapery, for a building cost less than $400,000 [37].

This set of drawings produced a more favorable reaction from the trustees, Brooks, and Parker. Huttenlocher reported that Brooks "likes Saarinen's [plans] very much," and "Parker was very enthusiastic in favor of the plans and said that he thought they would be the talk of the art world and this museum would be pointed to as a model of modern architecture."

One trustee said he "liked these very much and was very happy about them," although another reaction was that "these were better than the first, but he still did not like modern architecture" [38].

In May it was moved that Saarinen's plans be developed and "that the plans and specifications be completed as soon as possible," bids be received from contractors, and the Estate Trustees be approached for funds. Also the design, which was to include a Coffin Room, was to be shown to the trustees of that estate for their approval [30]. The estimated cost of the building then was about $500,000.

At a special July meeting it was moved "that the museum be called 'The Des Moines Art Center'. With the exception of one vote, the motion passed unanimously. In a letter the dissenter said he thought "that the name is cheap" [31].

Because the working drawings would not be ready until December, Brooks wanted to "immediately" let the contract for excavations, footings, and foundations. However, the Building Committee wanted "to let one over-all contract and know in advance within 10% of what the cost of the building will be." Therefore they decided to wait until Brooks-Borg had completed the drawings and specifications. In October Saarinen and Swanson came to Des Moines and with Brooks-Borg "unanimously approved" a sample of Lannon stone wall and a contract was let [33].

Contractors were finally requested to submit proposals for construction, and the contract was awarded to Neumann and Brothers. Construction began in 1946.

Early in 1948 Saarinen recommended Church and Kiley to "design the landscaping of the grounds." Their nomination was approved and they were to be instructed to work with Saarinen.

After a process whose completion took ten years, the Des Moines Art Center had its grand opening on June 2, 3, and 4, 1948. The final cost of the building came to $675,000, which was paid by the trust which had accrued over the years [2:69].

Sharing equal importance with the gallery is the art school where both professionals and students, housewives, children, and hobbyists could work together. Eliel Saarinen stated that the intent of the school was "to build up an atmosphere of art creation about the whole Art Center and to create a place of interest to all the strata of the population, old and young – through the young" [2:67].

PART 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE EARLIER PORTION

General Statement: When the Edmundson Foundation Trustees selected Greenwood Park for the site of their building there was a formal garden in the park. This garden became the focus for both John Brooks' and Eliel Saarinen's designs. Although the board was never satisfied with the schemes which John Brooks submitted, it seems that just one set of ideas was developed over the years rather than an investigation of different alternatives [4]. A set of drawings by Brooks-Borg, dated January 22, 1944, reflects the more informal concept of the building that the committee originally had in mind. In addition to two galleries, one 40' X 90' and the other 32' X 44', there was a library, a music gallery or auditorium-reception hall, a garden club room, and a meeting room for use by community groups.

The Saarinen design also has two galleries, one 37' X 119' and the other 20' X 80', over 1000 square feet more floor space than the Brooks-Borg design, for a total of just over 6,000 square feet. In addition, Saarinen had a large lobby, 62' X 31', that could be used for exhibits. The auditorium had a small stage and contained fixed seating on a flat floor, a change from Plan No. 4. A garden club room was omitted.

A major change by Saarinen was to move the entrance from the west side of the building to the east. Earlier plans had the west location because of easy access and parking. The main reason for the shift to the east was probably so that people leaving downtown on Grand Avenue would see the entrance of the building as they approached it. Again, this was a move not totally accepted by the trustees [36].

The other important feature of Saarinen's plan is that he developed the educational wing into a school, with much studio and shop space. The plan of January 1944 also outlined living quarters for an artist in residence, including a small atelier and studio.

PART 3. HISTORY OF THE LATER PORTION

Dates of construction: 1967-1968

Architect: I. M. Pei and Partners, New York City. The architects in charge were Richard M. Mixon and Graene A. Whitelaw.

Consultants: structural engineers: Weiskopf and Pickworth, New York City;
mechanical engineers: Robson and Woese, Inc., Syracuse, N.Y.

General contractor: Weitz Company, Des Moines, Iowa

Process of Design: Since the Des Moines Art Center opened in 1948, its collection grew in both size and stature. Since the original Eliel Saarinen building was designed primarily to house paintings, there was no adequate space for the display of sculpture. The Gardner Cowles Foundation in planning with the Art Center agreed to fund construction of a "sculpture garden or court." On January 19, 1965, "Mr. David Kruidener announced the magnanimous gift to the Des Moines Art Center of $300,000 for the construction of an addition to the building." The gift included the following stipulations. The primary construction was for a "sculpture garden or court" that could be used year round. Additional gallery space could be provided; however, the addition was "not to include additional studio, classroom or office space." "This project is to be completely financed by the Gardner Cowles Foundation without any outside help" and "may possibly include the purchase of a major piece of sculpture," if there were funds available. The foundation asked for the "employment of a well-known non-local architect," and "reserved the right to approve all architectural plans and designs." The building, "to be named in memory of Florence and Gardner Cowles, Sr." was "to go forward as soon as possible" [6]. A second major gift was received in July when it was announced that the Levitt family "has given $200,000 to the Center for a new auditorium" [8].

In March it was recommended that the Art Center contact a planning firm to study the "facilities and make recommendations for our early and future needs." This "firm would not necessarily be hired to do the specific design of the building" [8]. The office of Sasaki, Dawson and Demay were selected to do the planning work.

An extensive search for an architect was undertaken. Joe Lacy of Eero Saarinen & Associates, who had worked with Eero Saarinen on designs for Drake University in Des Moines, was contacted, but he turned the job down because the office was too busy. Contact was made with several nationally known architects and a letter was sent to the sculptor Isamu Naguchi for his ideas.

On a visit to New York in August, 1965, David Kruidener met with I. M. Pei, who, after having a "thorough discussion and background of the Art Center... indicated an interest in taking on the architectural work." Even at this early stage, the question of what style to build in arose. Some people thought it should closely match the Saarinen building. Pei raised the same question about modern architecture that had been raised 25 years before and said that the building should be of its own time [45]. In later talking about the museum Pei said, "the problem was to reconcile two generations of architecture without compromising either, so that one plus one would equal more than two" [3]. He thought that the building should be of reinforced concrete and that some compatibility with the original building could be achieved by using Lannon stone as an aggregate in the concrete. Because it proved to be too soft, another stone was substituted when construction actually began. Having just used bush-hammered concrete on the Atmospheric Research Center at Boulder, Colorado, Pei thought that the same technique would be a good way of exposing the aggregate of the sculpture court. Before the August 5 meeting was over, Pei made some

preliminary sketches, the concepts of which were basically that of the finished building [42]. Pei said he planned on coming to Des Moines later that month to visit the site. Kruidener reported that Pei intended "to make this a personal project of his own." To assist him he would assign one of his associates who had worked on the Everson Art Museum in Syracuse, the firm's first museum, the working drawings of which were being completed at that time [45].

Because the office was busy, they did not think that they could begin work until January, 1966. The tentative schedule was that after development of the concept and design a presentation would be made to the Art Center board of trustees either in late March or early April for their approval. Following cost estimation Pei hoped to begin working drawings about June 1. This work was scheduled to take three months, and with a month to accept bids, he hoped for a bid letting about September 1. With construction estimated to take 9 to 12 months, the building should have been completed in the late summer or early fall of 1967. While Pei thought the $500,000 budget was not large, he believed it to be adequate [42].

Considering that the bequest stated that the court or garden should be used in both summer and winter, the board of trustees had the idea of designing the building with a roof that could be rolled back. Their early estimate of the size of the building was 5,000 to 6,000 square feet for the sculpture court and a 250 seat auditorium [44].

At the trustee's September meeting it was moved to retain Pei as the architect for the addition [70]. By October Pei's office had started "to make some preliminary sketches for the Sculpture Court and the Lecture Hall [46]. Even after the size of the building had been cut in March 1966, Pei's design

was larger and costlier than what the board had planned. The upper floor was 7,790 square feet, and the lower level, with additional sculpture exhibit space and the 250 seat auditorium, was 9,710 square feet. With an estimate of $40 per square foot, the building would cost approximately $700,000. The architects believed "that any further reduction of the present plans would impair the spatial and circulation qualities that are incorporated in this scheme" [47].

At one time studies were made for having two buildings, one for the sculpture court and the other for the auditorium. The architects re-examined the possibility of two separate buildings, but "believed that this approach would be too costly, and an architectural solution that is not correct for the program of the existing Art Center building" [47]. It is interesting to note that the sculpture court in Pei's design became an interior space — that is, a sculpture gallery — whose large windows and dramatic clearstory retain the original concept of a court through extensive visual contact with the sky above, the trees and garden to the south, and the courtyard on the north, now totally surrounded by the building.

Because the trustees liked Pei's design they were reluctant to start the design process over again. Instead, they decided to raise additional funds, and considerable effort went into this drive. The original Cowles gift was increased to over $500,000 and the Levitts raised theirs to $275,000. Additionally, the Meredith Foundation gave $100,000 for the small west gallery that connects to the Saarinen building, and Maytag gave $60,000 for redoing the pool.

When the contractors' bids came in there was slightly more than $1,000,000 available. The Weitz Company's low bid was approximately $350,000 high. Pei believed that $200,000-$250,000 could be cut in order to go ahead with the project [44]. November was devoted to cost cutting. The terrace on the south

side toward the formal garden was dropped. Toilets below the west gallery and drinking fountains were eliminated. Approximately $50,000 could have been saved by making a substitute for the travertine floor, but the substitution was rejected.

Construction was begun in 1967, and by December of that year, over three months after the originally estimated completion date, construction on the new wing was approximately half completed [51]. When the building was finally completed in 1968, the cost had come to about $1,100,000, or over twice the amount of the original donations.

The plan of I. M. Pei's addition completes the "U" of Saarinen's auditorium and galleries by enclosing the fourth side and allows a complete circulation pattern around the building. The original auditorium and stage were converted into three small galleries, and the meeting room has become the museum shop.

PART 4. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. AIA Journal. "1969 Honor Awards; Des Moines Art Center Addition." June 1969, p. 98.

2. Architectural Forum. "Art Center in Des Moines, Iowa." July 1949, pp. 65-69.

3. _____. "Concrete Frames for Works of Art." June 1969, pp. 54-67.

4. Brooks, John. Brooks, Borg & Skiles, Des Moines, Iowa. Interview, June 27, 1974.

5. Darling, Jay N. Letter to Trustees of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation. Undated. Noted on the letter "rec'd D.M. 1-19-45."

6. Des Moines Art Center. Board of Trustees, Edmundson Art Foundation. Minutes, January 19, 1965.

7. Des Moines Art Center. Board of Trustees, Edmundson Art Foundation. Minutes, March 16, 1965.

8. Des Moines Art Center. Board of Trustees, Des Moines Art Center. Minutes, July 20, 1965.

9. Des Moines Art Center. Board of Trustees, Des Moines Art Center. Minutes, September 21, 1965.

10. Des Moines Art Center. Des Moines Art Center Association Board. Minutes, April 5, 1948.

11. Des Moines Art Center. Des Moines Art Center Association Board. Minutes, April 22, 1948.

12. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Adjourned Annual Meeting of ..., June 8, 1938.

13. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Adjourned Annual Meeting of ..., June 29, 1945.

14. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., with report on Site, Plans and Related Matters, May 25, 1939.

15. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., May 14, 1940.

16. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., May 13, 1941.

17. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., June 5, 1942.

18. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., June 8, 1943.

19. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., June 6, 1944 (w/rpt of bldg. com.)

20. Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of ..., June 5, 1945.

21. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Dec. 6, 1939.

22. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Sept. 17, 1940.

23. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Nov. 11, 1941.

24. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Sept. 22, 1943.

25. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Jan. 4, 1944.

26. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Jan. 25, 1944.

27. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, June 13, 1944.

28. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Nov. 7, 1944 (w/ltr from F. W. Hubbell).

29. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Jan. 5, 1945.

30. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, May 31, 1945.

31. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, July 10, 1945.

32. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Sept. 5, 1945.

33. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Edmundson Memorial Foundation Trustees, Nov. 7, 1945.

34. Huttenlocher, Forest. Letter to John Brooks, Jan. 23, 1945.

35. Huttenlocher, Forest. Letter to Jay N. Darling, Nov. 8, 1941.

36. Huttenlocher, Forest. Letter to Jay N. Darling, Jan. 9, 1945.

37. Huttenlocher, Forest. Letter to Jay N. Darling, March 22, 1945.

38. Huttenlocher, Forest. Letter to Jay N. Darling, May 3, 1945.

39. Huttenlocher, Forest. Letter to Henry Frankel, Jan. 19, 1945.

40. Interiors. "Art Center for Des Moines," September 1948, p. 108.

41. Jordy, William H. and Wright, Henry L. "PSFS." Architectural Forum, May 1964, pp. 124-129, 143.

42. Kruidener, David. Des Moines Register & Tribune. Interview, July 16, 1974.

43. Kruidener, David. Letter to Members of the Building Committee [Des Moines Art Center], Nov. 3, 1966.

44. Kruidener, David. Letter to I. M. Pei, Febr. 25, 1966.

45. Kruidener, David. "Visit with I. M. Pei", August 5, 1965.

46. Lym, Robert. Letter to Thomas S. Tibbs, Oct. 27, 1965.

47. Mixon, Richard. Letter to Thomas S. Tibbs, March 9, 1966.

48. Patrick, Peggy. Assistant Director Des Moines Art Center. Interview, June 21, 1974.

49. Saarinen, Eliel. Letter to Forest Huttenlocher, Jan. 18, 1945.

50. Setzer, Bernice V. Letter to Jay N. Darling, Jan. 25, 1945.

51. Whitelaw, Graene A. Letter to Thomas S. Tibbs, Dec. 29, 1967.

52. _____. Letter to The Weitz Co., Inc., April 25, 1968.

Credits

Field inspection, research, and writing: John H. Maves, Assistant Professor

Editing: Wesley Ivan Shank, Professor, Department of Architecture, Iowa State University, 1974

Edited for HABS: Druscilla J. Null, Historian